Interview Summary	10/676,837	CHERDRON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ISAAC T. TECKLU	2192	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):			
(1) <u>ISAAC T. TECKLU</u> .	(3)		
Jeffrey A. Berkowitz, Reg. No. 36,743. (4)			
Date of Interview: 22 May 2009.			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2)⊡ applicant's representative]			
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:			
Claim(s) discussed: <u>16-18</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: Kekic (US 6,664,978 B1).			
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner contacted Mr. Berkowitz to propose amendment to put the case in condition for allowance. Examiner proposed to include the 'accessing' aspect of the limitation to each independent claim 16 and 18. Mr. Berkowitz accepted examiner's proposal.			
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)			
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.			
/Isaac T Tecklu/			

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner, Art Unit 2192